

Applicant: YOSHINAGA *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/766,472  
Filing Date: January 29, 2004  
Page: 4 of 7

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed August 13, 2007 (hereinafter "Final Action"), claims 1 and 4 have been amended and claim 2 has been cancelled. Therefore, claim 1, 3 and 4 are pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not present any new issues that would require further consideration and/or search as the claim changes merely employ limitations from dependent claims that should have already been searched; (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of claims; and (d) place the application in better form for Appeal, should an Appeal be necessary. Entry of this Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner has objected to claim 3 for allegedly containing informalities. In response, independent claim 1 has been amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objections is earnestly sought.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1 and 4 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,698 to Riedel *et al.* ("Riedel"). Claims 1-4 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,461,570 to Wang *et al.* ("Wang"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reason that neither Riedel nor Wang explicitly nor impliedly discloses each of the elements of claims 1, 3 and 4.

First, claim 2 has been cancelled and incorporated into claims 1 and 4. Since claim 2 was not rejected by Riedel, a discussion of Riedel will be omitted.

A patent claim is anticipated if a prior art reference discloses, either expressly or inherently, all of the limitations of the claim. In a proper novelty rejection under 35 U.S.C.

Applicant: YOSHINAGA *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/766,472  
Filing Date: January 29, 2004  
Page: 5 of 7

§102, “the **identical** invention **must** be shown **in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.**” (See MPEP §2131, citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989), emphasis added). Further, “the elements **must be arranged as required by the claim.**” (See MPEP §2131, citing In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990), emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the present rejections in view of Wang do not meet these requirements.

Applicants disagree with the propriety of the rejection. However, solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, claims 1 and 4 have been amended to clarify points of novelty over Wang. With this said, claim 1 is directed to a display device of an injection molding machine that operates in accordance with an operating condition and recites, *inter alia*, a storage process unit which stores history data indicative of the change in the operating condition and the state of the operating quality corresponding to the change, wherein the storage process unit records data indicative of product identification data indicating a product produced by the injection molding machine in accordance with the change in the operating condition and the history data corresponding to the product identification data and a unit which displays the history data in claim 1.

Moreover, claim 4 is directed to a history collecting system and recites, *inter alia*, a unit which reads history data indicative of a change in the operating condition and a state of an operating quality corresponding to the change in the operating condition from the display device using the communication unit and a unit which stores the history data, wherein the storage unit records data indicative of a product identification data indicating a product produced by the injection molding machine in accordance with the change in the operating condition and the history data corresponding to the product identification data in claim 4.

Wang discloses a quality control system for a contact lens manufacturing facility that automatically acquires process control data from a plurality of manufacturing process controllers that control contact lens production and that can automatically process the data for real-time display and off-line analysis purposes. See, column 1, line 64 – column 2, lines 2 of Wang. Specifically, the cited portions of Wang disclose a plurality of operator stations 400 including display server 404 and user interface manager 502 which are connected by a

Applicant: YOSHINAGA *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/766,472  
Filing Date: January 29, 2004  
Page: 6 of 7

network 99 to an offline analysis node 500, a data acquisition node 100. *See*, Figure 1 of Wang.

Thus, the cited portions of Wang disclose a plurality of display devices, whereas, the invention as claimed recites a display device. In other words, Wang does not disclose a single display device of an injection molding machine that operates in accordance with an operating condition and recites, *inter alia*, a storage process unit which stores history data indicative of the change in the operating condition and the state of the operating quality corresponding to the change, wherein the storage process unit records data indicative of product identification data indicating a product produced by the injection molding machine in accordance with the change in the operating condition and the history data corresponding to the product identification data and a unit which displays the history data. Therefore, the cited portions of Wang fail to anticipate claim 1 *at least* because they fail to disclose all the features of claim 1. Moreover, claim 4 recites similar aspects as recited in claim 1, is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Claim 3 is patentable over Wang at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, and for the additional features they recite.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Applicant: YOSHINAGA *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/766,472  
Filing Date: January 29, 2004  
Page: 7 of 7

**CONCLUSION**

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **October 15, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By: Christopher M. Tucker  
Christopher M. Tucker  
Registration No. 48,783

**PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP**  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
Direct Dial: 703-770-7646  
Main: 703-770-7900  
Fax: 703-770-7901